

## Comptes rendus / Book Reviews 243

fait ressortir qu'à leur apogée dans les années 1950, ces « écoles du bonheur » n'attirent que 10 % des étudiantes et Robert Gagnon suggère la grande popularité des *Business colleges* chez les jeunes Montréalaises pour la même période (Micheline Dumont, *L'instruction des filles au Québec, 1639-1960*, Ottawa, Société historique du Canada, 1990; Robert Gagnon, *Histoire de la Commission des écoles catholiques de Montréal*, Montréal, Boréal, 1996). On peut également déplorer l'omission d'une bibliographie et une chronologie englobante minimisant trop souvent les changements dans le temps durant les cent ans parcourus. Enfin, l'ouvrage aurait gagné à caractériser davantage les populations scolaires ciblées et à établir quelques comparaisons avec la réalité d'autres régions du Québec afin de définir la spécificité des écoles d'Hochelaga-Maisonneuve.

Cela dit, il faut admettre qu'offrir un ouvrage accessible tout en exprimant la complexité d'un siècle d'histoire scolaire n'est pas chose simple et que la prétention des auteurs n'est nullement de proposer une synthèse, mais bien une série de portraits, tant humains que matériels. À ce sujet, le recours à des témoignages traduisant la mémoire de ceux et celles ayant fréquenté les écoles d'Hochelaga-Maisonneuve donne une couleur particulière à ce « livre-exposition » en humanisant son propos. On reconnaît là l'influence des huit tomes de l'*Histoire des écoles d'Hochelaga-Maisonneuve* de Robert Cadotte, Paul Labonne et Colette Noël. Même s'il n'est pas le public ciblé, il est fort à parier que le lecteur érudit prendra plaisir à parcourir ce livre pour la diversité et la grande qualité des documents iconographiques qu'il rassemble de même que pour la richesse des anecdotes qu'il recèle.

Andréanne LeBrun  
*Université de Sherbrooke*

CAMPBELL, Lara, Dominique CLÉMENT and Gregory S. KEALEY – *Debating Dissent: Canada and the Sixties*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012. Pp. 370.

A few years ago, I got to spend two full days involved in a series of in-depth discussions regarding my work on the 1960s with a group of historians representing a diverse range of interests. Over the course of these meetings, many of these scholars demonstrated serious concerns about the periodization of the Canadian 1960s employed by a lot of our colleagues. I was even asked, quite simply (but rather acidly), *Are you one of those "Long Sixties" people?* One historian of P. R. China went so far as to claim that, in her view, 1960s exceptionalism was plainly "bad history" since it approached the past unthinkingly, simultaneously imposing rigid temporal boundaries around events while relegating unhelpful happenings into the background. During my "job talk" I was asked whether I thought (presumably along with others in the field) that the late 1970s was just a brief blip, bereft of meaning, since these four or five years were little more than a bridge into the next eminently significant decade, the 1980s. I could only jokingly reply

that perhaps we were in need of a “Long Eighties” concept as a remedy, so we could pull those orphaned years into a new and meaningful narrative. Or, maybe we could just jettison the late-seventies entirely, and that way erase checkered polyester, John Travolta, and shag carpeting? Anyway.

For all of the profusion of recent academic attention to the Canadian 1960s, a surprisingly limited amount of consideration has been aimed at this central question: What are we talking about when we talk about “The Sixties” in Canada? Is it a temporal period? (Turns out: almost never.) Then, is it a condition? A rupture? A thing? An idea? How we choose to answer this question says a lot about what we are asking of the period, and the way we have framed it in our minds. If this seems obvious, well, it should. And yet, so often we have failed to grapple with that brilliant day-glo elephant right there in the conference room.

As perhaps among the crankiest observers of the “Long Sixties” approach, I am so pleased that we can turn to this volume for an insightful, challenging, and provocative attempt to engage the idea. In their indispensable introduction, two of the editors of this collection offer a thoroughgoing discussion of precisely this question: “If historians reject both the decadal approach and the explanation of rupture, what characterizes the sixties as a particular period of study?” (p. 7) Even if I tend to find their solution—“we present the ‘sixties’ as an *idea*, linked only roughly to a moment in time, without borders” (p. 7)—to be tautological, the very fact of their deliberate engagement with the question strikes me as precisely the kind of work we need to be doing. I can’t imagine teaching another course on the Canadian 1960s without assigning this introduction as a required, foundational reading.

The remainder of the collection suffers somewhat in comparison to the bravura intro, although it still represents, in the aggregate, the single best volume we have on these “Long Sixties” in Canada. Comprised of some thirteen discrete essays on an impressive range of topics authored by almost every one of the emerging (and fully emerged) authorities on the period, *Debating Dissent* is a terrific introductory resource. Top shelf work from Erika Dyck on LSD, Matthew Hayday on constitutional rights and language politics, Michael Boudreau on Vancouver’s counterculture, and Catherine Carstairs on the advent of health food, stand only slightly taller than the other generally very good articles. Most importantly, the collection offers engagements with most—though surely not all—of the “big issues” at stake in the 1960s. James W.G. Walker’s contribution, a study of the emergence of the Black United Front in Halifax, begins to fill what remains a troubling blind spot for many Canadians, and provides a fascinating analysis of the American influence on Canadian activists. Stephen Azzi’s article on Canadian nationalism grapples in helpful ways with the central question of English Canadian identity viz. the United States in this period of civil unrest. Steve Hewitt and Christabelle Sethna’s work on the RCMP and the Abortion Caravan illuminates the strategies employed by many feminists to confront (and subvert) the paternalism of a male-dominated state. Rounding out the collection, Catherine Gidney, Marcel Martel and Roberta Lexier offer respective studies of different manifestations of resistance at Canadian universities, José E. Igartua provides an

overview of “The Sixties in Quebec”, Peter S. McNinnis explores the role of the wildcat strike in labour activism in the era, and Bryan D. Palmer explores the Red Power movement and some of its manifestations.

The only major complaint I have, and which I imagine many of my colleagues (if not our students) will share, is that in order to produce a slim, manageable volume, these essays are all quite brief. Indeed, many feel badly truncated, as though deeper conclusions and analyses were available, but had to be excised somewhere along the line. This is unfortunate (if understandable given the constraints of the publishing industry in these difficult times). However, if you are looking for a collection of introductory essays on a broad range of topics on the Canadian 1960s, there is no book I would recommend ahead of *Debating Dissent*.

Stuart Henderson  
McMaster University

CHRISTOU, Theodore Michael – *Progressive Education: Revisioning and Reframing Ontario's Public Schools, 1919-1942*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012. Pp. 256.

While most historians and scholars of education generally take for granted that the concept of progressive education has existed for more than a century, its history in Canada has yet to be written. Christou's *Progressive Education: Revisioning and Reframing Ontario's Public Schools, 1919-1942* attempts to address this absence through an examination of what he calls “progressivist language” during the interwar years. A former school teacher and rising scholar in the field of educational history, Christou informs the reader that undertaking this study was a very personal pursuit for him. As a teacher, he had been “accused of being a *progressive* on three different occasions” (p. 3), and for three different reasons. The question that lingered in his mind after each accusation was: what exactly is a progressive? This question led him to graduate school and the writing of the most in depth study of progressive education in Ontario to date.

Christou uses a number of primary and secondary sources in his study, but two in particular inform the bulk of his probe into progressivist language in the interwar period: *The School*, an educational journal written for teachers, teacher candidates, and school administrators; and, *The Canadian School Journal*, the official organ of the Ontario Educational Association. From the beginning of his analysis Christou concedes that there was a confusion and lack of clarity in these journals regarding what progressive education meant (p. 36). Nevertheless, Christou is able to weave consistency and order out of the various definitions attributed to it. By probing the language used in the two journals for common themes or domains, the author identifies three: the promotion of active learning, the shift toward individualized instruction, and the progressive educator's concerns for closer bonds between school and society.